

6.0 Cumulative Impacts

The State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15355) define a cumulative impact as “an impact which is created as a result of the combination of the project evaluated in the EIR together with other projects causing related impacts.” The Guidelines further state that “an EIR should not discuss impacts which do not result in part from the evaluated project.”

Section 15130(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires a discussion of cumulative impacts of a project “when the project’s incremental effect is cumulatively considerable.” Cumulatively considerable, as defined in Section 15065(c), “means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probably future projects.”

The evaluation of cumulative impacts is required by Section 15130(b)(1) to be based on either (a) “a list of past, present, and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts, including, if necessary, those impacts outside the control of the agency,” or (b) “a summary of projections contained in an adopted plan or related planning document, or in a prior environmental document which has been adopted or certified, which described or evaluated regional or area wide conditions contributing to the cumulative impact.” This analysis relies on regional planning documents, in accordance with Section 15130(b)(1)(B), to serve as a basis for the analysis of the cumulative effects of the proposed UCSP.

Pursuant to Section 15130(d), cumulative impact discussions may rely on previously approved land use documents such as general plans, specific plans, and local coastal plans and may be incorporated by reference. In addition, no further cumulative impact analysis is required when a project is consistent with such plans, where the lead agency determines that the regional or area-wide cumulative impacts of the proposed project have already been adequately addressed in a certified EIR for that plan.

In addition, Section 15130(e) states that an EIR “should not further analyze a cumulative impact if it was adequately addressed in a prior EIR for a community plan, zoning action, or general plan, and the project is consistent with that plan.”

The cumulative impacts assessment in this section primarily relies on the cumulative impact determinations in the Chula Vista GPU EIR. The following issues were identified as cumulatively significant in the GPU EIR: landform alteration/aesthetics; cultural resources; paleontological resources; transportation; noise; potable water; energy; and housing and population. Where the UCSP would add incremental effects to the issues identified above, the effects associated with the UCSP are also considered cumulatively significant.

Other regional plans used to assess cumulative impacts in this section include: the Chula Vista General Plan; the SANDAG Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP); the Chula Vista MSCP; the Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin; the San Diego APCD RAQS; and the Regional Water Facilities Master Plan. These plans are discussed in the Environmental Impact Analysis, Section 5.0, of this EIR, and are incorporated by reference in the cumulative analysis below. These documents are on file at the City of Chula Vista and are available for review at the Chula Vista Planning Department at 276 Fourth Avenue and the Chula Vista Civic Center Library at 365 F Street in the City of Chula Vista.

On July 23, 2004, the SANDAG Board of Directors adopted the RCP for the San Diego region. The RCP serves as the long-term planning framework for the San Diego region. It provides a broad context in which local and regional decisions can be made that move the region toward a sustainable future; a future with more choices and opportunities for all residents of the region. The RCP integrates local land use and transportation decisions and focuses attention on future growth. The RCP contains an incentive-based approach to encourage and channel growth into existing and future urban areas and smart growth communities.

The goal of the RCP is to ensure a high quality of life for current and future generations and to work toward a society that has resolved its housing shortage, transportation problems, and energy issues, and provides healthy, desirable environments for people and nature.

The basis for determining the direct impacts of the adoption of the UCSP assumes the GPU growth projections for the area outside of the UCSP area. The GPU provides the basis for the cumulative analysis presented in this section. The growth projections used in the GPU are consistent for each of the issues evaluated. Since the GPU uses worst-case environmental assumptions, the GPU assumptions were used for the cumulative analysis. The cumulative discussion evaluates the proposed project for conformance to the GPU and identifies those areas where the UCSP may differ from that plan. In addition, the potential effect of the development was considered.

A broad examination of cumulative impacts involves considering the project together with growth of the City. Development pursuant to the GPU would occur in accordance with the land use designations and development intensities identified in the Land Use and Transportation Element. These designations promote the redevelopment of underused land to higher uses, compact development, mixed-use development to promote a pedestrian-friendly environment, an improved balance between employment and housing, and protection of Chula Vista's natural resources.

The land uses and the associated potential development designated in the GPU correlates to regional growth estimates made by SANDAG. SANDAG estimates anticipated growth for the 18 cities and the unincorporated areas within San Diego County for the purpose of allocating growth to specific areas and identifying regional transportation infrastructure needed to support regional growth.

The population growth projected to occur by 2030 would necessitate augmentation of the City's current housing stock, infrastructure, and public services. Cumulative impacts would occur as a result of multiple projects developed by 2030. The proposed GPU strategy is to anticipate the cumulative effects of growth and plan for it in a manner that is balanced in its approach. The focused growth strategy addresses future growth as a whole, and proposes policies to avoid impacts on a cumulative basis.

6.1 Land Use, Planning, and Zoning

SANDAG forecasts significant population growth for the region. By 2030, the City of Chula Vista was projected by SANDAG to reach a population of 280,000. City of Chula Vista GPU projections forecast an even greater number, with a projected population of 300,000 by the year 2030. The City's GPU, in consideration of smart growth principles and recognition of demographic trends toward city center revitalization, seeks to direct such growth to the already developed, western portion of the City; the traditional urban core of the City. This is in marked contrast to the earlier General Plan update in 1989 which sought to accommodate population growth in the undeveloped eastern portion of the City. To this end, the City has developed the UCSP in order to implement the vision of the urban core included in the GPU. The City is also currently planning the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan for the bayfront area west of the UCSP, which will complement the land use plans and goals of the UCSP and urban core area.

The proposed UCSP is consistent with the goals and policies of the GPU and serves as the implementing document to realize the GPU vision for the urban core. Through land use development regulations (zoning) and development design guidelines, the UCSP, in conformance with the GPU, provides for the orderly growth of the City. The land use regulatory provisions of the UCSP apply only to the UCSP Subdistricts Area, while existing Municipal Code zoning regulations will continue to apply in the surrounding study area; thereby promoting more intense residential and commercial land uses in the Subdistricts Area while preserving the existing lower density residential uses in the study area.

The proposed UCSP, in conjunction with redevelopment and greater utilization of existing land within western Chula Vista, would contribute to an overall increase in urban density within this area. According to the GPU, the number of multi-family units within the UCSP Subdistricts Area would increase at buildout from 3,700 existing units to 10,800 units through in-fill and limited redevelopment. The City's GPU has anticipated these cumulative effects associated with a more urban and dense redevelopment environment and created specific design and planning standards, which are mirrored in the UCSP, to ensure an effective use of land within the UCSP area. Planned for increases in urban density could have concomitant increases in density driven cumulative environmental impacts, such as traffic, noise, air quality, public services, and public utilities. However, because these effects were anticipated and planned for in the GPU, and the proposed UCSP is in

conformance with the GPU, no cumulative land use and planning impacts would occur with implementation of the UCSP.

6.2 Landform and Visual Aesthetics

The cumulative assessment of landform alteration/aesthetics impacts relies on SANDAG's Regional Comprehensive Plan and the analysis of cumulative landform alteration/aesthetics impacts in the certified EIR for the GPU. Development in the UCSP Subdistricts area would occur in previously developed locations. The aesthetic effects of the proposed UCSP are focused on the bulk and mass represented by the designated land uses. The potential for an adverse effect is contingent upon the design and location of future buildings.

Future growth has the potential to impact the visual environment through fundamental changes in land use. Adoption of the UCSP would result in increased density within the UCSP Subdistricts Area which would result in increased building heights and mass. The UCSP contains regulations and design standards which outline allowable and recommended parameters for the development of the Subdistricts Area. The design guidelines for the UCSP contain standards such as building heights and massing, protection of public view corridors, and circulation linkages, that establish mixed-use development and achieve a high quality pedestrian-scaled environment.

The change in visual quality within the UCSP area would contribute incrementally to cumulative impacts with regards to aesthetics. However, design controls placed on subsequent projects by the City would ensure that development occurs in accordance with the City's goals and design objectives for this area; therefore, the project would not result in cumulative negative aesthetic impacts.

6.3 Cultural Resources

The cumulative assessment of cultural resources impacts relies on SANDAG's Regional Comprehensive Plan and the analyses of cumulative cultural resources impacts in the certified EIR for the GPU. The continued pressure to develop or redevelop areas would result in incremental impacts to the historic record in the San Diego region. Regardless of the efforts to avoid impacts to cultural resources, the more that land is converted to developed uses the greater the potential for impacts to cultural resources. While any individual project may avoid or mitigate the direct loss of a specific resource, the effect is considerable when considered cumulatively.

The RCP concluded that the loss of historic or prehistoric resources from the past, present, and probable future projects in the Southern California/Northern Baja California, Mexico areas would contribute to cumulatively significant impacts to cultural resources. The EIR for the GPU indicated that Implementation of the proposed general plan, in conjunction with

other future projects, would result in a significant cumulative impact to cultural resources. The GPU EIR established mitigation measures for western Chula Vista which require that an archaeological survey shall be completed for any development project that includes previously undisturbed acreage and that any future development that has not been previously examined shall be subject to a cultural resources survey to identify any specific resources that could be potentially affected by the proposed project. These mitigation measures would reduce incremental cumulative impacts associated with the GPU adoption, but it would not reduce the cumulative impact to cultural resources to below a level of significance due to the RCP conclusion that any loss of cultural resources would be significant. The proposed UCSP conforms to the mitigation measures of the GPU through incorporation of Mitigation Measures 5.3.5-1 through 5.3.5.5 in this EIR, and to the analysis completed for the GPU EIR. The cumulative effect on cultural resources resulting from the adoption of the UCSP, in conformance with the GPU is therefore significant and unmitigated.

6.4 Paleontological Resources

The cumulative assessment of paleontological resources impacts relies on SANDAG's Regional Comprehensive Plan and the analyses of cumulative paleontological resources impacts in the certified EIR for the GPU. The GPU EIR concluded that impacts to paleontological resources, similar to cultural resources, would be cumulatively significant. Mitigation measures that incorporated a grading threshold and pre-construction and construction monitoring protocol were included in the GPU EIR and were concluded to reduce impacts to below a level of significance. The proposed UCSP conforms to the analysis completed for the GPU EIR and the mitigation measures of the GPU EIR through incorporation of Mitigation Measure 5.5-1 in this EIR.

As discussed in Section 5.5, Paleontological Resources, the majority of the UCSP area overlies geologic formations assigned a moderate sensitivity rating. Based on the excavation activities associated with development, the UCSP has the potential to impact subsurface paleontological resources. Mitigation measures have been identified to reduce potential impacts to below a level of significance. Future projects would be required to implement similar mitigation measures if they would result in the potential for significant impacts to important paleontological resources. Therefore, implementation of the mitigation measures 5.5-1 through 5.5-4 would reduce cumulative impacts to paleontological resources to below a level of significance.

6.5 Hydrology and Water Quality

The cumulative assessment of hydrology and water quality resources impacts relies on the analyses of hydrology and water quality resources impacts in the certified EIR for the GPU.

The GPU EIR concluded when compared to existing land uses, buildout of the UCSP would not introduce substantially increased amounts of impermeable surfaces to the project site. However, the project's increase in impermeable surfaces may reduce the amount of infiltration occurring at the project site and increase storm water runoff. When considered with other development projects within the region, this alteration to natural hydrology and drainage could cumulatively impact downstream water resources. As discussed in Section 5.7, Hydrology and Water Quality, mitigation has been identified to reduce impacts to hydrology, drainage, and water quality which mirror the mitigation measures identified in the GPU EIR. Future projects would be required to implement these mitigation measures for specific projects as well as adhere to the City's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit, the City's Urban Runoff Management Plan, and prepare project specific Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plans. Implementation of these requirements would reduce cumulatively significant impacts to below a level of significance.

6.6 Transportation, Circulation, and Access

The cumulative assessment of transportation impacts relies on the analyses of transportation impacts in the certified EIR for the GPU. The GPU EIR concluded that implementation of the GPU proposed Urban Core Roadway system was not significant, because policies in the GPU provided for the establishment of an Urban Core Improvement Program that would provide adequate urban amenities and would facilitate multimodal transportation systems. No further mitigation was required in the GPU EIR.

The long-term traffic analysis conducted for the proposed UCSP has employed the regional traffic database and modeling used by SANDAG and assumed 2030 buildout conditions under the GPU. As such, it included the projected growth for the region, including both growth in regional trips and anticipated expansion of the circulation system. Traffic effects identified in Chapter 5.8 of this EIR are significant. Nineteen intersections and three roadway segments within the UCSP area would operate at unacceptable levels of service. The traffic analyses included mitigation measures to reduce significant cumulative traffic impacts. However, not all impacts would be mitigated to below a level of significance. Therefore, significant and unmitigated cumulative traffic impacts are noted for the street network. The mitigation measure presented in Section 5.8 of this EIR would reduce some of the incremental cumulative impacts associated with the proposed UCSP; however, these measures would not reduce the cumulative traffic impacts to below a level of significance.

6.7 Air Quality

The cumulative assessment of air quality impacts relies on SANDAG's Regional Comprehensive Plan and the analyses of air quality impacts in the certified EIR for the GPU. The cumulative assessment of air quality impacts relies on the current Regional Air Quality

Strategy (RAQS). In order to meet federal air quality standards in California, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) required each air district to develop its own strategy for achieving the NAAQS. The San Diego Air Pollution Control District (San Diego APCD) prepared the 1991/1992 RAQS in response to the requirements set forth in Assembly Bill (AB) 2595. The RAQS set forth the steps needed to accomplish attainment of state and federal ambient air quality standards.

The current RAQS are based on the former General Plan. Because the significant air impact stems from an inconsistency between the General Plan Update and the former General Plan upon which the RAQS were based, the only measure that can lessen this impact is the revision of the RAQS based on the General Plan Update. This effort is the responsibility of SANDAG and San Diego APCD and is outside the jurisdiction of the City. The City recommends that SANDAG and the San Diego APCD incorporate the changes in the GPU and UCSP in their triennial review and revision of the RAQS to eliminate the present inconsistency. In addition, the development regulations and design guidelines of the UCSP shall be applied to all subsequent development projects to ensure they do not obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plans.

The San Diego Air Basin is in non-attainment for federal and state ozone standards, federal and state $PM_{2.5}$ standards, and state PM_{10} standards. An increase in air emissions would be roughly proportional to an increase in population. While commercial and industrial sources would contribute to these emissions, proportional increase in residential units can serve as a general indicator of the potential for population growth and related air quality effects. The GPU EIR included a mitigation measure to address PM_{10} that required active dust control during construction. This same measure has been incorporated into this EIR in section 5.10. Because the air basin is in non-attainment for ozone, $PM_{2.5}$, and PM_{10} , the potential increase in residential units and the activities associated with population growth, even as mitigated by the City in its CO_2 Reduction Plan and Growth Management Program, represents a cumulatively considerable and significant air quality impact.

Although there is no adopted standard for sensitive receivers adjacent to Interstate 5, it was determined that air quality impacts from diesel particulates emanating from the freeway would be cumulatively significant given current basin-wide noncompliance with particulate standards and projected future levels of diesel particulates emanating from Interstate 5.

6.8 Noise

The cumulative assessment of noise impacts relies on SANDAG's Regional Comprehensive Plan and the analyses of noise impacts in the certified EIR for the GPU. Cumulative noise impacts would generally be attributed to increases in traffic volumes. Because all jurisdictions have land use guidelines for placement of future sensitive land uses in noise impact areas, future development would not result in significant impacts. As discussed in

Section 5.9, Noise, of this EIR, the traffic volumes used in the noise report are based on the cumulative effects of traffic. As such, the noise analysis is a cumulative analysis. With the implementation of Noise Mitigation Measures 5.9-1 through 5.9-4, significant noise impacts resulting from the approval of the UCSP will be mitigated to less than significant.

6.9 Public Services and Utilities

The cumulative assessment of public services and utilities relies on SANDAG's Regional Comprehensive Plan and the analyses of public services and utilities impacts in the certified EIR for the GPU.

6.9.1 Water

Cumulative impacts to water supply associated with ongoing development on a regional scale are anticipated. The UCSP would require water service from the Sweetwater Authority. Development of the UCSP would contribute incrementally to the impacts on water services required for the region.

The UCSP, as well as future development, would be required to adhere to the City's Threshold Standards Policy. This policy requires the City to provide the San Diego County Water Authority, the Sweetwater Authority, and the Otay Municipal Water district with a 12- to 18-month development forecast and request an evaluation of their ability to accommodate the forecast and continuing growth.

As discussed in Section 5.12.1, Public Utilities, the Water Supply Assessment prepared by the Sweetwater Authority indicates that there will be sufficient water supplies to meet the projected demands of buildout of the UCSP and the existing and planned development projects within Sweetwater's service area in both normal and dry year forecasts. Therefore, impacts are less than significant.

6.9.2 Wastewater

As identified in Section 5.12, Public Utilities, the UCSP would increase the expected sewage load on the G Street Trunk sewer basin, the Industrial Avenue Trunk sewer basin, and the Main Street Trunk sewer basin. When added to other past, existing, and future planned development, the development of the UCSP would contribute incrementally to impacts to sewer systems serving the region.

The proposed project, as well as future development, would be required to adhere to the City's Threshold Standards Policy. This policy requires the City to provide the San Diego Metropolitan Sewer Authority with a 12- to 18-month forecast and request confirmation that the projection is within the City's purchased capacity rights and an evaluation of their ability

to accommodate the forecast and continuing growth. Adherence to the City policies would ensure that cumulative impacts are less than significant.

6.9.3 Integrated Waste Management

Buildout of the UCSP, in conjunction with past, present, and future projects, would increase the amount of solid waste generated within the region. The nearest landfill to the project site is the Otay Landfill, which has adequate capacity through 2030. Additionally, as required by the City of Chula Vista, all development completed under the UCSP would implement programs and policies related to solid waste management, which include curbside recycling programs. Present and future development would be required to implement similar waste management programs that would ensure that cumulative solid waste impacts are less than significant.

6.9.4 Energy

Buildout of the UCSP would increase the demand for both electricity and natural gas. Impacts to energy are considered significant because there is no long-term assurance that energy supplies will be available at buildout of the UCSP, avoidance of energy impacts cannot be assured regardless of land use designation or population size. Although changes to planned land uses in the City would continue to implement the Energy Strategy Action Plan, San Diego Regional Energy Plan and Transit First Plan, implementation of the proposed land uses identified in the UCSP has the potential to result in impacts to energy resources as a result of anticipated growth. The mitigation measures identified in Section 5.12.5, Public Utilities, would reduce significant energy impacts. While the mitigation measure presented in Section 5.12.5 of this EIR would reduce some of the incremental cumulative impacts associated with the proposed UCSP, these measures would not reduce the cumulative energy impacts to below a level of significance because future energy supplies cannot be assured.

6.9.5 Law Enforcement, Fire Protection, and Emergency Medical Services

The overall population growth would substantially increase demands on law enforcement, fire protection, and emergency medical services. The cumulative impact would be potentially significant. The projected three-fold increase in residential and commercial population of the UCSP area would substantially increase demand for law enforcement. While not specifically quantified, staffing and new facilities would be required to adequately accommodate the population increase expected at buildout. A public facilities development impacts fee would be collected at the time of subsequent individual development proposals, as part of the citywide program (Municipal Code Chapter 3.50) to fund and construct needed public infrastructure. The provision of future law enforcement personnel would be

scheduled and funded through the City's annual budget review and through the Fire Master Plan. Public infrastructure would be provided incrementally but concurrent with need. With the development of master plans for fire service, law enforcement, and emergency, the cumulative impacts would be reduced to a level below significance.

6.9.6 Schools

Development of the UCSP would result in 7,100 net new multi-family units, which would add to the regional, cumulative demand for elementary, middle, and high schools to serve its population. The proposed UCSP would contribute to the cumulative need for additional Chula Vista Unified School (CVESD) school facilities by adding 2,485 new K-8 students, and would contribute to the cumulative need for Sweetwater Unified High School District (SUHSD) resources by adding 1,392 new students. Based on the generation rates discussed in Section 5.11, Public Services, the CVESD schools that serve the Urban Core area are currently at or near capacity and would require 59 or more additional classrooms to serve the proposed UCSP. The SUHSD has indicated that planned construction of a new high school and expansion of existing middle schools in western Chula Vista would be adequate to serve the UCSP. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 5.11.3-1 would assist in school impact fees that would lead to future construction of new facilities to serve the anticipated student population growth. Similarly, present and future development would be required to contribute to school impact fees. Contribution of these fees would ensure that cumulative impacts are less than significant.

6.9.7 Library Services

Development of the UCSP would create a demand for library services to serve its residents and contribute to the regional, cumulative demand for library services. When considered with past, present, and future developments, the project would contribute an incremental demand on libraries. Based on the expected net increase in population of 18,318 with buildout of the UCSP, increased demand on existing library services would amount to approximately 9,159 square feet of library facilities and 54,954 books.

However, development completed in conformance with the UCSP would contribute development fees that would be used towards library facilities within the City, in accordance with the City's Growth Management Ordinance. Similarly, present and future development would be required to contribute fees towards development of library facilities within the City. Contribution of these fees would ensure that cumulative impacts are less than significant. The Municipal Code (Chapter 3.50) includes provisions that require the City to use the public facilities development impact fees to construct needed improvements and to ensure that adequate funds are available in the impact fee account to build the needed improvements.

6.9.8 Parks and Recreation

Cumulatively, the proposed and approved projects in the region would place substantial demands on neighborhood, community, and regional parks. Buildout of the entire UCSP area could result in an estimated net increase population of 18,318. Applying the 3 acres per 1,000 resident parkland requirement results in full buildout of the UCSP would being required to provide up to approximately 55 acres of new parkland. This additional parkland would be required incrementally and commensurate with new development.

The cumulative impacts on local and regional park and recreational facilities would be potentially significant. New development in the City of Chula Vista is required to provide public parkland, improved to City standards and dedicated to the City. Parkland dedication requirements are specified in Section 17.10.040 of the Chula Vista Municipal Code. The Parkland Dedication Ordinance requires three acres of neighborhood and community park per 1,000 residents.

The UCSP proposes meeting the parkland requirement resulting from development by establishing an urban gathering network in the form of parks, plazas, paseos, and informal pedestrian spaces. These improvements include improving and expanding existing park space to make the spaces more usable. A parks master plan is currently underway for the Urban Core area, which will identify park facility needs, potential locations, connections with the surrounding community, and conceptual designs for parks. The parks master plan will inventory City-owned sites and consider joint use of other public facilities within the UCSP area. Implementation of the Mitigation Measure 5.11.5-1 would generate park and recreation impact fees that would lead to future construction of new facilities to serve the anticipated population growth. The UCSP establishes a Community Benefit Program that includes enhancements to park and recreation facilities in relation to projected buildout of the UCSP over the 25-year project horizon. As a condition of project approval, individual developers shall pay the public facilities fees at the rate in effect at the time building permits are issued. Similarly, present and future development would be required to contribute development fees. The Municipal Code (Chapter 3.50) includes provisions that require the City to use the public facilities development impact fees to construct needed improvements and to ensure that adequate funds are available in the impact fee account to build the needed improvements. Contribution of these fees would ensure that cumulative impacts are less than significant.

6.10 Hazards/Risk of Upset

The cumulative assessment of hazards/risk of upset relies on the analyses hazards impacts in the certified EIR for the GPU. As discussed in Section 5.13, Hazards/Risk of Upset, the UCSP does not propose specific land uses that are anticipated to transport, use, dispose, or release hazardous materials. However, during the reconnaissance survey several

properties of environmental concern were identified that use, store, and transport hazardous materials. Development in accordance with the UCSP has the potential to place people adjacent to these sites, and, therefore, has the potential to expose people to hazards. The majority of hazardous sites identified within the UCSP area coincide with commercial and light industrial land uses. Similar land uses throughout western Chula Vista would also likely contain numerous hazardous materials and thus the UCSP hazardous sites comprise a cumulative contribution to the regional inventory. Mitigation measures have been identified to reduce potential impacts to below a level of significance. Future projects would be required to implement similar mitigation measures if they would result in the potential for significant impacts. Therefore, implementation of the mitigation measures 5.13-1 would reduce cumulative impacts related to hazards/risk of upset to below a level of significance.

6.11 Geology and Soils

The major geologic hazards associated with the proposed UCSP and future development are related to landslides, liquefaction, and earthquakes. The increase in population would occur with buildout of the UCSP and the City's General Plan would combine with other population growth in the county that would expose more people to similar risks.

As discussed in Section 5.4, Geology and Soils, no significant adverse impacts have been identified regarding the geology and soils of the Urban Core. Potential impacts to future development would be reduced to below a level of significance through implementation of remedial measures identified in the geotechnical investigations, which are required by the Grading Ordinance, for all new development within the City. In addition, conformance to building construction standards for seismic safety with the Uniform Building Code (UBC) would assure that new structures would be able to withstand anticipated seismic events within the City. Therefore, implementation of the UCSP and associated future development would not contribute to cumulative impacts related to geology and soils.

6.12 Housing and Population

The cumulative assessment of housing and population relies on the analyses of housing and population impacts contained in the certified EIR for the GPU. The GPU EIR concluded that cumulative housing and population impacts would not be significant and therefore no mitigation measures were required. The proposed UCSP conforms to the analysis completed for the GPU EIR. The UCSP would contribute a net increase of 7,100 multi-family dwelling units to the housing stock within the City. Thus, the project would contribute cumulatively to housing opportunities within the City, contributing to an increase in the City's population. Population growth associated with the UCSP would not exceed City growth projections, and thus, such an increase in population is included with the City's buildout

population. The project is not expected to induce development of other areas, and no cumulative impacts to population or housing would occur.

6.13 Biological Resources

The majority of the land area within the UCSP area has been previously developed with residential, commercial, and industrial uses. The potential for significant biological resources to be present in the UCSP area is low. Implementation of the UCSP would not result in significant impacts to biological resources. When considered with past, present, and future development in the region, development of the UCSP would not contribute incrementally to a cumulatively significant impact to biological resources.

6.14 Agriculture

There are no agricultural lands within the Urban Core or central Chula Vista. Additionally, there are no lands zoned for agriculture within this area. When considered with past, present, and future development in the region, development of the UCSP would not contribute incrementally to a cumulatively significant agricultural impact.

6.15 Mineral Resources

The UCSP area is underlain with Quaternary Terrace Deposits. The majority of western Chula Vista, including the UCSP area, has been previously developed so the potential for significant mineral resources is considered low. No regionally significant MRZ-2 aggregate resource areas are designated within this update area. Implementation of the UCSP would not result in significant impacts to mineral resources. When considered with past, present, and future development in the region, development of the UCSP would not contribute incrementally to a cumulatively significant impact to mineral resources.

7.0 Growth Inducement

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(d) requires that an EIR discuss the growth-inducing impact of the proposed project. The Guidelines require that the EIR, “Discuss ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Included in this are projects which would remove obstacles to population growth (a major expansion of a waste water treatment plant might, for example, allow for more construction in service areas).”

SANDAG is the agency responsible for forecasting regional growth. They indicate that population grows in two ways: (1) natural increase, which results from the number of births over deaths; and (2) net migration, which is primarily based on the condition of the local economy (SANDAG 2003). SANDAG forecasts significant growth for the region and the City of Chula Vista over the next 25 years. The Chula Vista GPU was developed in response to anticipated growth. While growth in the recent past was accommodated in previously undeveloped land in the eastern portion of the City, the GPU aims to direct growth toward the already urbanized western portions of the City.

The proposed UCSP provides the land use development zoning and design guidelines necessary to implement the vision of the GPU and to accommodate growth in the urban core area. Based on principles of smart growth, the UCSP serves to reduce sprawl by focusing future growth in the City core through redevelopment and new/infill development, emphasizing pedestrian-friendly design and mixed use development. The proposed UCSP is specifically intended to provide for the orderly growth of the city of Chula Vista, define the limits to that growth, and act as a mechanism to accommodate and control future growth. Development permitted would provide needed housing, create compact and pedestrian-friendly urban development, and protect natural resources. The UCSP would result in a more inclusive community, maintain a balance between housing and employment, and foster a stable economic base and diverse employment opportunities.

The UCSP does not propose to increase capacities of utilities and infrastructure within the Urban Core. The plan does recognize that infrastructure capacities will have to be increased to accommodate projected growth, but does not propose to make those improvements at this time. As discussed in the services and utilities chapters of this document, provision of utilities will require specific project level information and will be reviewed on an individual project basis.

The proposed UCSP would accommodate an increase in population within the Urban Core. Table 7-1 summarizes the increase in population and housing units over the existing condition. These figures are derived from the projections for the GPU. That analysis indicated that there would be 10,800 units in the urban core at buildout and that there are

currently 3,700 existing units. Using the population generation rate provided in the GPU of 2.58 people per unit for multi-family units, a population of 18,318 people is projected for the Urban Core. New residents would locate in Chula Vista because of the diverse employment base and proposed new housing developments.

**TABLE 7-1
INCREASE IN POPULATION AND HOUSING UNITS
OVER EXISTING CONDITIONS**

Population Increase Over Existing Condition	Increase in Housing Units Over Existing Condition
18,318	7,100

The proposed UCSP would accommodate additional growth beyond existing conditions. As such, people may choose to live in Chula Vista rather than elsewhere in the San Diego region. In addition, the increased population in the area of Chula Vista may foster economic growth in the area by increasing demand for local serving retail, and increased employment opportunity. Because no specific use is identified, any effect resulting from this indirect economic growth on other areas in the region would be speculative.

The growth effects of the UCSP result from people electing to live and work in Chula Vista, rather than elsewhere in the region and beyond. Because the UCSP establishes land uses that can accommodate growth, thereby removing a barrier to growth in the city, it is growth inducing. The issues discussed in the Environmental Impact Analysis section of this EIR address the direct and indirect effects of this growth. Since there are impacts resulting from issues associated with this growth, the growth-inducing impacts of the proposed UCSP are considered significant. The mitigation measures for the growth-inducing impacts are set forth in sections 5.1 through 5.12 of this EIR and are contained in the development regulations and design guidelines of the UCSP, which are intended to accommodate anticipated growth in the City in the Subdistricts Area.

8.0 Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes

Section 15126.2(c) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR consider significant irreversible environmental changes that would result from the proposed actions should they be implemented. According to the CEQA Guidelines:

Uses of nonrenewable resources during the initial and continued phases of the project may be irreversible since a large commitment of such resources makes removal or nonuse thereafter unlikely. Primary impacts and, particularly, secondary impacts (such as highway improvements which provide access to a previously inaccessible area) generally commit future generations to similar uses. Also irreversible damage can result from environmental accidents associated with the project. Irretrievable commitments of resources should be evaluated to assure that such current consumption is justified.

Nonrenewable resources generally include biological habitat, agricultural land, mineral deposits, water bodies, and some energy sources. As will be discussed in Chapter 9.0, approval of the proposed UCSP will not have any significant irreversible impacts on biological, agricultural, or mineral resources. The UCSP area is the urban core of the City of Chula Vista. It is highly urbanized and contains no native biological habitat. No agricultural soils occur within the UCSP area, and being urbanized, it would not be conducive to agricultural production. No significant mineral deposits underlie the UCSP area. No water bodies occur within the UCSP area and mandatory state and federal water quality control measures would minimize any potential urban runoff pollutant concerns.

Energy resources would be consumed during construction of future projects in conformance with the UCSP. Implementation of the proposed UCSP would result in the short-term commitment of nonrenewable and/or slowly renewable energy resources as well as natural resources such as lumber and other forest products, sand and gravel, asphalt, steel, copper, lead, other metals, and water due to construction activities. Use of these resources would represent an incremental effect on the regional consumption of these commodities.

Energy would also be consumed to provide operational lighting, heating, cooling, and transportation for future development. Both residential and non-residential development would require the long-term commitment of energy resources in the form of natural gas and electricity generated by coal, natural gas or hydroelectric power. Increased motor vehicle travel would result in the long-term commitment of fossil fuels unless alternative fuel vehicles ultimately replace the internal combustion engine on a broad scale. The availability of mass transit and encouragement of other non-motorized modes of transport provided in the development standards, design guidelines, and public realm and community benefit

programs of the UCSP may serve to reduce consumption of gasoline associated with commute trips.

The UCSP additionally contains basic design guidelines and resources for designing and building sustainably “to minimize the use of energy, water and other natural resources” (UCSP Chapter VII Design Guidelines, Special Guidelines, Environmental Sustainability Goals, p. VII-123). The City of Chula Vista participates in the LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) Rating System and as stated in the UCSP “all newly constructed City-sponsored building in the Urban Core shall incorporate sufficient green building methods and techniques to qualify for the equivalent of LEED Silver.” The LEED is a voluntary, national standard developed by the US Green Building Council (GBC for developing proven, high-performance, sustainable buildings. The GBC has four LEED levels, in descending levels of performance: platinum, gold, silver, and certified; and several programs and design criteria for different types of structures, including commercial, residential, infill development, new construction, and renovations to existing structures. Chapter VII of the UCSP contains an overview of these programs and design criteria, plus an outline of the advantages of green building practices. Further elaboration of the LEED programs and certification requirements can be obtained from the US Green Building Council’s website at www.usgbc.org.

To earn LEED certification, a project applicant project must satisfy all of the prerequisites and a minimum number of points to attain a LEED certified rating level. This application process includes a LEED Scorecard which future project applicants will submit to the City of Chula Vista Community Development Director along with their Urban Core Development Permit application. In addition, development projects may qualify for FAR increases and priority permit review (as specified in UCSP Chapter VI, Urban Amenities Table) if a LEED certified rating is achieved. As higher building performance is achieved (i.e. silver, gold or platinum), increased levels of FAR incentives are available.

While green building practices are not required for private development within the UCSP area, a completed LEED scorecard is required with every Urban Core Development Permit application. Private developments are also strongly encouraged to utilize green building practices through the support of City staff and through the guidelines and incentives contained in the UCSP. Incorporation of green building design into subsequent individual development projects may serve to reduce irreversible water, energy and building materials consumption associated with construction and occupation of structures within the UCSP area.

9.0 Effects Found Not to Be Significant

9.1 Mineral Resources

The majority of western Chula Vista, including the UCSP area, has been previously developed, so the potential for significant mineral resources extraction is considered low. The UCSP area is underlain with Quaternary Terrace Deposits which are not considered to have a high potential for mineral resources. No regionally significant MRZ-2 aggregate resource areas are designated within the UCSP area.

Implementation of the UCSP would not result in significant impacts to mineral resources.

9.2 Biological Resources

The UCSP area is the urban core of the City of Chula Vista and has been developed with residential, commercial, and industrial uses since the early twentieth century. This highly urbanized setting is almost entirely lacking in native vegetation and its associated wildlife. The only perennial vegetation within the urban core includes ornamental trees, parkways, lawns, and gardens. The value of these ornamentals to native wildlife are insignificant in their present location. Implementation of the UCSP would not result in significant impacts to biological resources.

9.3 Agriculture

There are no agricultural zoned lands nor any land under agricultural use or appropriate for agriculture in the UCSP area. The area within the UCSP has been previously developed with residential, commercial, and industrial uses. No lands designated as prime agricultural soils by the Soils Conservation Service nor prime farmlands designated by the California Department of Conservation occur within the UCSP area. Nor is the UCSP area near a Williamson Act Contract pursuant to Section 51201 of the California Government Code.

Implementation of the UCSP would not result in significant impacts to agricultural resources.

10.0 Alternatives

In order to fully evaluate the environmental effects of proposed projects, CEQA mandates that alternatives to the proposed project be analyzed. Section 15126.6 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires the discussion of “a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project” and the evaluation of the comparative merits of the alternatives. The alternatives discussion is intended to “focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project,” even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives. The project objectives are enumerated in Section 3.3 of this EIR.

Three project alternatives in accordance with the requirements of CEQA were evaluated for this project. They include the No Project Alternative, the Reduced Project Alternative, and the Automobile Priority Alternative. Each major issue area included in the detailed impact analysis of this EIR (Chapter 5) has been given consideration in the alternative analysis.

As required under Section 15126.6 (e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, the EIR must identify the environmentally superior alternative. Pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines, if the No Project Alternative is determined to be the most environmentally superior project, then another alternative among the alternatives evaluated must be identified as the environmentally superior project. The most environmentally superior alternative, as identified in the analyses below, would be the Reduced Project Alternative. Both the Reduced Project Alternative and the No Project Alternative, in comparison with the proposed UCSP, would lessen impacts to landform/aesthetics, transportation, air quality, noise, and public services and utilities due largely to lesser population and land use intensification within the UCSP Subdistricts Area. Because the potential footprint of impact area is roughly the same for all scenarios, impacts to cultural and paleontological resources, geology and soils, population and housing, and hazardous materials risks would be roughly equivalent for the proposed UCSP and the No Project and Reduced Project alternatives. Land use impacts would be greater in the No Project Alternative than in the Reduced Project Alternative or proposed UCSP due to existing zoning being out of conformance with the adopted GPU. All issue areas impacts would be identical in the Automobile Priority Alternative to the proposed UCSP except for the issue of transportation, which would incur less of an impact in the Automobile Priority Alternative than in the proposed UCSP, but still greater than the transportation impacts identified for the No Project and Reduced Project alternatives.

10.1 No Project Alternative

The No Project alternative would continue to implement the current adopted Municipal Code Zoning in the Subdistricts Area of the UCSP. The current zoning conforms to the former General Plan, rather than the currently adopted General Plan Update (GPU). California law requires zoning ordinances to be consistent with the adopted GPU. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would result in the zoning for the Subdistricts Area of the UCSP being inconsistent with the GPU.

Table 5.1-2 in the Land Use section of this Program EIR lists the existing zoning for the UCSP Subdistricts Area. The location of these zones within and surrounding the UCSP Subdistricts Area is illustrated in Figure 5.1-3. Under the No Project Alternative, it is estimated that approximately 1,000 additional residential units could be built in the 690 acre Subdistricts Area. This number was estimated from the GPU EIR No Project alternative (Final EIR page 617) which identified capacity for approximately 1,429 additional residential units allowed under the “former” 1989 General Plan when compared to the existing condition. This remaining residential capacity related to the Urban Core Subarea of the Northwest Planning Area. The extent of the UCSP Subdistrict Area is approximately 67 percent of the larger Urban Core Subarea described in the GPU EIR as 1,031 acres. In addition, the No Project Alternative is anticipated to allow additional commercial and office growth compared to the existing condition, considering the underutilized extent of many of the commercially zoned properties throughout the UCSP Subdistricts Area.

Existing Municipal Code Zoning within the UCSP Subdistricts Area includes the zones and approximate acreages listed below in Table 10-1. The acreages represent approximations determined by the Chula Vista Community Development Department.

**TABLE 10-1
EXISTING ZONING DISTRIBUTION WITHIN THE UCSP SUBDISTRICTS AREA**

Existing Zoning	Gross Acres (approximate)	Percentage of Total Area
Single-family Residential (R-1)	14	2.0%
One- and Two-Family Residential (R-2)	14	2.0%
Apartment Residential (R-3)	153	22%
Mobile Home Park (MHP)	38	5.5%
Commercial (CB, CC, CO, CV, and CT) and Light Industrial (IL)	466	68%
PQ (Public/Quasi Public)	5	0.5%
Urban Core Total	690	100%

10.1.1 Land Use

Impacts to land use resulting from implementation of the No Project Alternative would be greater than those identified for the proposed UCSP because of inconsistency of existing Municipal Code Zoning with the adopted GPU.

As shown in Table 10-1 above, approximately 68 percent of the Subdistricts Area is currently zoned for commercial or light industrial uses. Another 22 percent is zoned for high-density residential. Thus, approximately 90 percent of the Subdistricts Area is zoned either for commercial or high-density residential. Only roughly 4 percent of the entire Subdistricts Area is zoned for single-family detached residences or duplexes. Public uses are currently zoned for approximately 1 percent of the total.

As noted in Section 5.1.3 of this EIR, existing zoning within the UCSP Subdistricts Area allows primarily low-rise (up to 45 feet in height) single-use commercial blocks to occupy the commercial corridors along Third Avenue, E Street, H Street, and Broadway, with low-rise multi-family residential uses (apartments and mobile homes) permitted on the periphery of the commercial areas and in the area west of Broadway. Taller building heights are permitted in several of the commercial zones given issuance of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). In addition, the portion of Third Avenue north of H Street and south of F Street, zoned CB, (central business) is allowed unrestricted building height. Presently, no buildings within this area exceed three stories (low-rise). Additional capacity as described above would be possible given the underutilized extent of many of the commercially zoned properties and the estimated residential capacity as identified in the GPU EIR.

In comparison with the proposed UCSP, the No Project Alternative represents less residential development in areas currently restricted to commercial business and retail use along the downtown segments of Third Avenue, along E Street in the vicinity of Third and Fourth Avenues, and decreased residential and transit-oriented uses in the vicinity of major transit corridors. The proposed UCSP permits increased density to allow for a greater degree of mixed-use development in key locations promoting pedestrian and transit-oriented development. The proposed UCSP zoning permits greater building heights and mass for most of the Subdistricts Area. Heights would be permitted to extend to mid-rise (45 feet to 84 feet in height) for many of the areas currently zoned for low-rise (45-foot) heights. In addition, the proposed UCSP would allow building heights up to 210 feet for two Transit Focus Areas centered on the E Street and H Street trolley stations. These areas are currently zoned for height limits of 45 feet except with a CUP.

The No Project alternative would continue to implement the current adopted Municipal Code Zoning in the Subdistricts Area of the UCSP. The current zoning conforms to the former General Plan, rather than the plan established by the currently adopted GPU. California law requires zoning ordinances to be consistent with the adopted GPU. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would result in the zoning for the Subdistricts Area of the UCSP being inconsistent with the GPU. This comprises a significant impact because the No Project

Alternative conflicts with an applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project which is a CEQA significance criterion.

10.1.2 Landform Alteration/Aesthetics

Impacts to aesthetics and visual character resulting from implementation of the No Project Alternative would be less than those identified for the proposed UCSP. Under the No Project Alternative, the visual character of the UCSP area pursuant to existing zoning would be similar to what exists today, with some exceptions. In the area around Third Avenue in the north of the UCSP area, the existing visual character consists of low-rise pedestrian-oriented specialty shops, restaurants, and small businesses that primarily serve local residents, with wide sidewalks along Third Avenue. Small residential housing units occupy the surrounding streets. The central portion of the UCSP Subdistricts Area is characterized by primarily low-rise, with some mid-rise single-use commercial uses along the E Street, H Street and Broadway commercial corridors. Low-rise multi-family housing extending from C to I Streets and mobile home parks between F and G Streets comprise the concentration of residential uses within the Subdistricts Area. Along segments of Broadway, current conditions, such as the palm-lined streets, accessibility to I-5 and trolley stations, proximity to downtown, and views to the bay, are often overshadowed by negative influences such as deteriorating streetscapes and signage along the corridor segments, lack of accessible park facilities, and poor pedestrian connectivity crossing I-5 to the Bayfront or to Broadway. Building heights are limited by existing zoning throughout the Subdistricts Area to 45 feet in height unless approved by Conditional Use Permit or unless coincident with the CB zone which allows unrestricted heights. The CB zone occurs along Third Avenue north of G Street, south of roughly F Street. Current building heights in this area are primarily low-rise.

In comparison with the proposed UCSP, the No Project Alternative represents a less intensified urban environment, with generally shorter building heights and less structural mass and density. The No Project Alternative also differs substantially from the proposed UCSP in that it allows the continuance of single-use zoned and occupied parcels, where commercial uses are restricted to certain blocks, offices to another, and residential to others. It also permits less residential development in the UCSP Subdistricts Area as a whole, by restricting residential uses to areas outlying the single-use commercially zoned corridors. The No Project Alternative could result in continued visual quality impacts associated with the growth permitted under the existing zoning in the absence of design guidelines for enhanced gateways, and other urban amenities as envisioned by the GPU and proposed by the UCSP.

The No Project Alternative does not reduce the footprint or location of development or change the nature of the projects that could be permitted within in the UCSP area. However, the No Project Alternative would lessen the aesthetic effects relative to the UCSP because of the lower densities, buildings heights and mass allowed with this alternative.

10.1.3 Biological Resources

There are no biological resources within the UCSP area, therefore, no impacts would occur by adoption of the proposed UCSP or the No Project Alternative.

10.1.4 Cultural and Paleontological Resources

Impacts to cultural and paleontological resources resulting from implementation of the No Project Alternative would be similar to those identified for the proposed UCSP. As with the proposed UCSP, implementation of the No Project Alternative would result in potentially significant impacts related to cultural and paleontological resources. The UCSP area contains several known and designated historic architectural resources (sites and structures). In addition, the UCSP area potentially contains additional as yet unidentified historically significant resources as defined by CEQA significance criteria. Demolition or substantial alteration of these historically significant architectural resources as a result of future development or redevelopment of the area (as allowed by existing underlying Redevelopment Plans and existing zoning) would comprise a significant cultural resources impact. In addition, future construction activities involving grading to depths equal to or greater than six feet may impact significant archaeological resources. In the unlikely event that prehistoric cultural materials are found during subsurface disturbance resulting from future developments, there would be a significant archaeological impact.

The UCSP area contains a large expanse of moderate paleontological resource sensitivity. Exposure or disturbance of soils greater than 5 feet in depth and at volumes in excess of 2000 cubic yards would require mitigation. These grading thresholds are likely to be exceeded under the No Project Alternative as existing buildings are replaced or redeveloped over time in accordance with underlying Redevelopment Plans and existing zoning. This comprises a significant paleontological impact.

The No Project Alternative and the proposed UCSP both allow development over roughly the same geographic area. As such, both the UCSP and the No Project Alternative have a roughly equivalent potential for impacting cultural and paleontological resources. Potential cultural and paleontological impacts resulting from future development and redevelopment in the UCSP area would be reduced below a level of significance through pre-construction monitoring, implementation of a construction mitigation program, and, for architectural resources, preservation, rehabilitation, relocation or historical documentation prior to demolition according to local, state, and federal standards.

10.1.5 Geology and Soils

Impacts to geology and soils resulting from implementation of the No Project Alternative are roughly equivalent to those identified for the proposed UCSP. As with the UCSP, implementation of the No Project Alternative has the potential to result in significant impacts

related to geology and soils. Future development would be exposed to geological hazards associated with seismic events, liquefaction, and expansive soils. Potential impacts resulting from geologic hazards would be reduced below a level of significance through project-specific design measures, including compliance with applicable building codes (e.g., Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, and the UBC). Additionally, a comprehensive, site-specific soil and geologic evaluation would be conducted for all future development projects to determine potential hazards and site conditions. The proposed UCSP and the No Project Alternative both allow development over roughly the same area. As such, both the UCSP and the No Project Alternative have a roughly equivalent potential for impacting geological resources.

10.1.6 Agriculture

There are no agricultural resources within the UCSP area, therefore no impacts to agricultural resources would occur by either the proposed UCSP or the No Project Alternative.

10.1.7 Hydrology and Water Quality

Impacts to hydrology and water quality resulting from implementation of the No Project Alternative would be less than those identified for the proposed UCSP. As with the proposed UCSP, implementation of the No Project Alternative has the potential to result in significant impacts related to water resources and quality. Future development within the Subdistricts Area would increase runoff by increasing the impermeable surface area. Future development that intensifies land use over existing conditions, would increase direct runoff to drainage basins, municipal storm water systems, and ultimately to receiving surface and ground water bodies. This runoff will likely contain typical urban runoff pollutants such as sediment, pathogens, heavy metals, petroleum products, nutrients, and trash.

While the proposed UCSP and the No Project Alternative both allow development of similar land use types (commercial and residential) over roughly the same geographic area, the No Project Alternative allows fewer total units and lower density, building heights and mass. Compared to the three-fold increase in residential units and commercial square footage allowed in the proposed UCSP, the No Project Alternative would allow an increase in both commercial/office development and some undeveloped residential capacity. Without project specifics it cannot be determined with certainty whether or not the greater intensification proposed under the UCSP would result in a larger amount of impermeable surface area compared to the No Project Alternative, or would result in a roughly equal amount of impermeable surface area due to intensification being realized in extruded building heights.

However, based strictly on the increase in allowable number of dwellings and commercial square footage proposed in the UCSP over the No Project Alternative, it can be concluded that the No Project Alternative would have less of an impact on water quality than the proposed UCSP. In either case, significant impacts to water quality resulting from future

development would be similarly mitigated through compliance with all applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations regarding water quality (e.g. JURMP, SUSMP, NPDES, SWPP, and City Development and Redevelopment Projects Storm Water Manual).

10.1.8 Transportation

Impacts to transportation resulting from implementation of the No Project Alternative would be less than those identified for the proposed UCSP. As with the proposed UCSP, implementation of the No Project Alternative has the potential to result in significant traffic and circulation impacts. Future development within the Subdistricts Area in accordance with existing zoning would potentially allow additional commercial uses, some residential development and would not provide for the benefits of mixed use and compact development which concentrates development at transit stations, and reduces long commute trips. Currently, all existing roadway segments and all except three existing intersections within the UCSP area operate at acceptable levels of service. The three-fold increase in residential and commercial population as projected in the proposed UCSP would result in two roadway segments and 19 intersections dropping below acceptable levels of service. While not quantifiable given the lack of available data, it can be assumed that the potential increase in the residential and commercial population of the UCSP area, as allowed by existing zoning, would also result in several roadway segments and intersections decreasing in levels of service. As such, both the UCSP and the No Project Alternative would result in significant traffic impacts; however, the No Project Alternative would likely have less of an impact in terms of number of roadways and intersections affected.

In regard to future demands for public transit services, a similar conclusion can be drawn. While both the proposed UCSP and the No Project Alternative would allow future development that would place greater demand on local and regional transit services, the lesser number of allowable residential units and commercial square footage resulting from existing zoning would create less of a future impact on area roadways and intersections and less of a demand on public transit services. In either case, significant impacts to transportation would require mitigation in the form of roadway and intersection improvements.

10.1.9 Air Quality

Air quality emissions resulting from implementation of the No Project Alternative would be potentially greater than those identified for the proposed UCSP. For comparative purposes, an assessment of the anticipated air emissions resulting from Year 2030 buildout of the former General Plan and the recently adopted GPU was prepared for the GPU EIR using the URBEMIS2002 computer program (Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District 2003).

Using the land use designations for the former General Plan (which the existing Municipal Code Zoning implements) and the adopted GPU, along with trip generation rates developed by SANDAG (SANDAG 2002), and URBEMIS2002 defaults for other parameters,

average daily emissions were estimated using URBEMIS2002 assuming buildout of the plans in the year 2030.

The results of the modeling concluded that with the exception of reactive organic gases, the emissions resulting from the adopted GPU, including NO_x compounds, are anticipated to be less than those that would occur under the former General Plan. In addition, the former General Plan shows an increase in PM₁₀ and SO_x relative to the existing condition.

Air quality impacts resulting from inconsistency with the SDAB RAQS would be less with implementation of the No Project Alternative than with implementation of the proposed UCSP. Because the No Project Alternative is consistent with the growth assumptions of the RAQS, implementation of the No Project Alternative would comply with the SANDAG TCM Plan and, therefore, would not result in significant air quality impacts. The proposed UCSP and the GPU is not in compliance with the SANDAG TCM Plan and as such is considered a significant impact. The No Project Alternative conforms to the program and does not represent a significant air plan impact.

10.1.10 Noise

Noise impacts resulting from implementation of the No Project Alternative would be less than those identified for the proposed UCSP. As with the proposed UCSP, development of the No Project Alternative has the potential to result in significant noise impacts. Development under the No Project Alternative, as with the proposed UCSP, would result in an increase in allowable density along highways and major arterials and adjacent to rail, thereby exposing potentially sensitive receptors (residential and park users) to noise levels in excess of applicable thresholds. However, given that the No Project Alternative allows less of an increase in allowable development compared to the three-fold increase allowed under the proposed UCSP, the noise impacts resulting from the No Project Alternative would be less than those incurred under the proposed UCSP. The proposed UCSP also allows a greater number of sensitive receptors to be placed adjacent to the San Diego Trolley line and Interstate 5, through increased density and building heights in these areas over existing zoning. As with the proposed UCSP, all future projects with the potential to be exposed to noise in excess of specified limits shall be required to complete applicable exterior and interior noise analyses and demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City Planning and Building Director, Community Development Director, or Building Official, that project-specific design includes measures to reduce any noise impacts to below a level of significance.

10.1.11 Public Services and Utilities

Impacts to public services and utilities resulting from implementation of the No Project Alternative would be less than those identified for the proposed UCSP. The No Project Alternative would allow an increase in the residential and commercial population of the

UCSP Subdistricts Area. This increase in population and land use intensity would result in an associated increase in demands for law enforcement, fire protection, educational services, libraries, and parks, as well as increased demands on supply and distribution of potable water, wastewater, solid waste and energy utilities. Impacts to the provision of these public services and utilities would be significant if provision of additional facilities, personnel or other resources does not coincide with the anticipated population growth and increased demand for these services and utilities. The No Project Alternative represents a decrease in potential population relative to the proposed UCSP, thus reducing the future demand for services and utilities.

The City of Chula Vista currently implements a public facilities development impact fee program that requires all new development within the City to contribute their fair share to the funding and construction of needed public infrastructure improvements. In addition, the City imposes various other levies (recreational facilities development impact fees, statutory school impacts fees) and programs (Growth Management Ordinance, Capital Improvement Program) that annually review, reprioritize and schedule needed citywide public infrastructure. Subsequent projects developed under the No Project Alternative (or the proposed UCSP) will be subject to the payment of applicable development impact fees at the rate in effect at the time building permits are issued in order to mitigate significant impacts to public services and utilities.

10.1.12 Population and Housing

Population and housing impacts resulting from implementation of the No Project Alternative would be equivalent to those identified for the proposed UCSP. As with the proposed UCSP, development of the No Project Alternative would not result in significant population and housing impacts. The No Project Alternative (and the proposed UCSP) would induce population growth and allow new development and redevelopment to accommodate growth that is already planned to occur locally. Development in accordance with the existing zoning of the No Project Alternative would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people necessitating the construction or replacement of housing elsewhere. Housing that may be removed by future individual projects (due to construction/redevelopment) would not necessitate the construction of housing elsewhere because the overall number of housing units allowed by the Project would be sufficient within the UCSP area to accommodate the affected population.

The proposed UCSP and the No Project Alternative both allow development over the same geographic area. As such, both the UCSP and the No Project Alternative have an equivalent potential for affecting population and housing, with both scenarios resulting in effects considered to be not significant. The UCSP would provide greater opportunity for new housing that would be more responsive to the regional housing needs as projected by SANDAG and the State Department of Housing and Community Development.

10.1.13 Hazards/Risk of Upset

Hazardous materials impacts resulting from implementation of the No Project Alternative would be the same as those identified for the proposed UCSP. The UCSP area contains numerous known and listed hazardous sites of potential environmental concern. Approximately 103 sites of potential environmental concern were identified in the UCSP Subdistricts Area through recent database research. In addition, the UCSP Subdistricts Area contains several older buildings which may contain hazardous building materials (lead, asbestos, PCBs) that could be exposed during demolition or renovation. Future development consistent with the No Project Alternative, as with the proposed UCSP, may result in significant impacts if such development allows greater contact between humans and hazards. In either case, significant hazardous materials impacts would be similarly mitigated through compliance with all applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations regarding hazardous materials siting, assessment and remediation. In addition, a risk assessment would be required at all sites within the UCSP area where contamination has been identified or is discovered during future construction activities; and a hazardous building materials survey would be conducted at all buildings in the UCSP area prior to demolition or renovation activities.

10.2 Reduced Project Alternative

The Reduced Project Alternative represents less residential development than the proposed project in areas currently restricted to retail use along the downtown segments of Third Avenue, along E Street in the vicinity of Third and Fourth Avenues, and decreased residential and transit-oriented uses in the vicinity of major transit corridors, over the proposed UCSP. The Reduced Project Alternative would result in a 25 percent reduction in the projected buildout of the proposed UCSP through 2030. This alternative does not change the proposed land uses, nor affect land use density. Under this alternative, a total of 9,025 residential units could be built in the UCSP Subdistricts Area rather than the 10,800 projected under the GPU and implemented by the proposed UCSP. This would result in a net increase of 5,325 residential units within the UCSP Subdistricts Area, compared to the net increase of 7,100 allowed in the proposed UCSP. Table 10-2 provides a comparison of projected buildout under the Reduced Project Alternative and the proposed UCSP. The purpose of this alternative is to reduce the impacts that would result from the adoption of the proposed plan as they relate to intensity of use. This alternative would specifically reduce impacts to traffic, air quality, noise, and public utilities and services (Table 10-2).

**TABLE 10-2
COMPARISON OF PROJECTED BUILDOUT FOR
REDUCED PROJECT ALTERNATIVE AND PROPOSED UCSP**

Land Use	Existing	Net Increase	Total
Reduced Project Alternative Projected Buildout			
Multi-family residential	3,700 dus	5,325 dus	9,025 dus
Commercial retail	3,000,000 sf	750,000 sf	3,750,000 sf
Commercial office	2,400,000 sf	975,000 sf	3,375,000 sf
Commercial-visitor serving		975,000 sf	975,000 sf
Proposed UCSP Projected Buildout			
Multi-family residential	3,700 dus	7,100 dus	10,800 dus
Commercial retail	3,000,000 sf	1,000,000 sf	4,000,000 sf
Commercial office	2,400,000 sf	1,300,000 sf	3,700,000 sf
Commercial-visitor serving		1,300,000 sf	1,300,000 sf

NOTE: All totals are approximate and may include a combination of new infill development and existing uses.

dus = dwelling units

sf = square feet

10.2.1 Land Use

Impacts to land use resulting from the Reduced Project Alternative would be the same as those identified for the proposed UCSP. The Reduced Project Alternative would implement the same zoning as the proposed UCSP. The zoning conforms to the adopted GPU. The proposed UCSP proposes changes in zoning to increase density and to allow for a greater degree of mixed-use development in key locations promoting pedestrian and transit oriented development. As identified in the Land Use section 5.1 of this EIR, future development's compliance with the UCSP's Land Use and Development Regulations and Development Design Guidelines, which are consistent with the adopted GPU would ensure that no significant land use adjacency/community character and planning conformance impacts would result from implementation of the UCSP.

The Municipal Code requires that the City implement the General Plan through zoning classifications. Because the Reduced Project Alternative would result in the same land use regulations as the proposed project, it would not result in the Urban Core planning area being out of compliance with the Municipal Code. Therefore, it would not conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project.

10.2.2 Landform Alteration/Aesthetics

Impacts to landform and aesthetics resulting from the Reduced Project Alternative would be less than those identified for the proposed UCSP. Adoption of the UCSP would result in substantial changes to visual quality throughout the UCSP area. Increased density within

the UCSP Subdistricts would result in increased number of buildings and greater building heights and mass than what exists today. By reducing the overall use of the area by 25 percent, these effects would be lessened. The development standards and design guidelines which outline allowable and recommended parameters for the development of the Subdistricts Area that are proposed as part of the proposed UCSP would also occur under this alternative. Compliance with these standards and guidelines ensure that development within the UCSP area would not result in architecture, urban design, landscaping, or landforms that negatively detract from the prevailing aesthetic character of the site or surrounding area. The Reduced Project Alternative does not reduce the footprint or location of development or change the nature of the projects that could be permitted within the Subdistricts Area; however, this alternative would lessen the aesthetic effects relative to the proposed UCSP because development intensity would be less (reduced by 25 percent) under this alternative.

Since individual project specifics are not known at this time, the extent to which they will conform to the UCSP development regulations and design guidelines cannot be determined. Without assurance of conformance with the UCSP, this impact remains significant, and will remain significant under the Reduced Project Alternative. Therefore, conditions of approval shall be required on a project by project basis to ensure development is consistent with the UCSP.

10.2.3 Biological Resources

There are no biological resources within the UCSP Subdistricts area, therefore, no impacts would occur by adoption of the proposed UCSP or the Reduced Project Alternative.

10.2.4 Cultural and Paleontological Resources

Impacts to cultural and paleontological resources resulting from the Reduced Project Alternative would be the same as those identified for the proposed UCSP. As noted in Section 5.3.4 of this EIR, 11 buildings or sites within the UCSP Subdistricts Area are currently designated or eligible to be designated as historically significant. Demolition or substantial alteration of these buildings as a result of future development in accordance with the proposed UCSP would comprise a significant cultural resources impact. The Reduced Project Alternative does not change this potential. As with the proposed UCSP, the loss or substantial alteration of as-yet unknown historically significant architectural resources or prehistoric and historic archaeological resources due to development of the Reduced Project Alternative would comprise a significant cultural resources impact.

While the likelihood of encountering significant archeological resources and human remains is low, future construction activities in accordance with the UCSP or the Reduced Project Alternative may impact such resources. Both the proposed UCSP and the Reduced Project

Alternative have an equivalent potential for affecting archaeological resources and human remains. This would comprise a significant archaeological impact.

Mitigation measures 5.3.5-1 through 5.3.5-5 detailed in Section 5.3.5 would be required to mitigate these impacts from the implementation of the Reduced Project Alternative. Preservation, adaptive reuse, rehabilitation, or relocation of a listed/eligible historic resource consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines would reduce impacts to said historical structures to below a level of significance. If on a project-specific basis, these actions are demonstrated to be infeasible and the resource would be demolished documentation, of the resource per HABS Level I may not be sufficient to reduce impacts to below a level of significance. In that case, impacts to architectural resources may be significant and unmitigated.

10.2.5 Geology and Soils

Geology and soils impacts resulting from the Reduced Project Alternative would be the same as those identified for the proposed UCSP. As with the proposed UCSP, implementation of the Reduced Project Alternative has the potential to result in significant impacts related to geology and soils. Future development would be exposed to geological hazards associated with seismic events, liquefaction, and expansive soils. Potential impacts resulting from geologic hazards would be reduced below a level of significance through project-specific design measures, including compliance with applicable building codes (e.g., Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, and the UBC). Additionally, a comprehensive, site-specific soil and geologic evaluation shall be conducted for all future projects to determine potential hazards and site conditions. The proposed UCSP and the Reduced Project Alternative both forecast development over roughly the same area. As such, both the proposed plan and the Reduced Project Alternative have an equivalent potential for impacting geological resources.

10.2.6 Agriculture

There are no agricultural resources within the UCSP area; therefore, no impacts to agricultural resources would occur by either the proposed UCSP or the Reduced Project Alternative.

10.2.7 Hydrology and Water Quality

Impacts to hydrology and water quality resulting from the Reduced Project Alternative would be roughly the same as those identified for the proposed UCSP. As with the proposed UCSP, implementation of the Reduced Project Alternative has the potential to result in significant impacts related to water resources and water quality. Future development would increase runoff by increasing the impermeable surface area. The proposed UCSP and the Reduced Project Alternative both forecast development over roughly the same area. As

such, both the proposed UCSP and the Reduced Project Alternative have roughly equivalent potential for impacting water quality. Significant impacts to water quality resulting from future development would be mitigated through compliance with all applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations regarding water quality (e.g. JURMP, SUSMP, NPDES, SWPP, and City Development and Redevelopment Projects Storm Water Manual).

10.2.8 Transportation

Impacts to transportation resulting from the Reduced Project Alternative would potentially be less than those identified for the proposed UCSP. As with the proposed UCSP, implementation of the Reduced Project Alternative has the potential to result in significant traffic and circulation impacts. Future development within the Subdistricts Area in accordance with the proposed UCSP would result in two roadway segments and 19 intersections dropping below acceptable levels of service. While not quantifiable given lack of available data, it can be assumed that the Reduced Project Alternative, which comprises a 25 percent reduction of the proposed UCSP, would also result in several roadway segments and intersections dropping below acceptable levels of service. As such, both the UCSP and the Reduced Project Alternative would result in significant traffic impacts; however, the Reduced Project Alternative would likely have less of an impact in terms of number of roadways and intersection affected.

In regard to future demands for public transit services, a similar conclusion can be drawn. While both the proposed UCSP and the Reduced Project Alternative would allow future development that would place greater demand on local and regional transit services, the lesser number of allowable residential units and commercial square footage resulting from the Reduced Project Alternative would create less of a future impact on area roadways and intersections and less of a demand on public transit services. In either case, significant impacts to transportation would require mitigation in the form of roadway and intersection improvements.

10.2.9 Air Quality

Air quality Impacts resulting from the Reduced Project Alternative would be less than those identified for the proposed UCSP. For comparative purposes, an assessment of the anticipated air emissions resulting from buildout of the GPU in the year 2030 under various alternative scenarios was prepared for the GPU EIR using the URBEMIS2002 computer program (Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District 2003). Using the land use designations for the adopted and preferred alternative General Plans, along with trip generation rates developed by SANDAG (SANDAG 2002), and URBEMIS2002 defaults for other parameters, average daily emissions were estimated using URBEMIS2002 assuming buildout of the plans in the year 2030. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 10-3 below.

TABLE 10-3
AVERAGE DAILY EMISSIONS TO THE SAN DIEGO AIR BASIN
(pounds per day)

Season/Pollutant	Urban Core Specific Plan (2030)			Reduced Project Alternative (2030)		
	Mobile Sources	Area Sources	Total ¹	Mobile Sources	Area Sources	Total ¹
Summer						
CO	5,796.00	64.08	5,860.20	5233.58	49.26	5282.84
NOx	503.60	151.60	655.20	454.59	116.05	570.65
ROG	512.50	537.10	1,049.70	451.71	450.40	902.11
SO _x ²	16.87	0.00	16.90	15.23	0.00	15.23
PM ₁₀	2,949.00	0.28	2,949.60	2662.42	0.22	2662.64
Winter						
CO	5,968.00	62.70	6,030.60	5,387.86	48.15	5436.01
NOx	754.6.0	151.60	906.20	681.18	116.03	797.21
ROG	531.90	537.00	1,068.90	480.20	450.24	930.47
SO _x ²	16.55	0.00	16.60	14.94	0.00	14.94
PM ₁₀	2,949.00	0.28	2,949.60	2,662.42	0.22	2662.64

¹Totals may differ due to rounding.

²Emissions calculated by URBEMIS2002 are for SO₂.

The results of the modeling concluded that with the exception of reactive organic gases, the emissions resulting from the Reduced Project Alternative will be less than those that would occur under the proposed UCSP.

As seen from Table 5.10-6 of Section 5.10 of this EIR, small individual projects are not expected to exceed the thresholds of significance. If the smaller projects were considered as a single project they might exceed the quarterly thresholds. The effects of projects such as those discussed in Section 5.10, would occur under the Reduced Project Alternative as well as the proposed UCSP. Emissions for both the proposed UCSP and the Reduced Project Alternative are anticipated to be below those that would occur under existing conditions due to improvements in mobile source emissions. As such, implementation of either alternative is not anticipated to have a significant air quality impact when compared to the existing condition. The Reduced Project Alternative represents an improvement in air quality over both the proposed UCSP and the existing condition.

Because the region is not in attainment for ozone and PM_{2.5} and is unclassifiable for PM₁₀, there is the potential for future projects that would conform to the UCSP to contribute to cumulatively considerable emissions should multiple projects be implemented simultaneously. Should multiple projects equivalent to 200 dwelling units per acre be initiated in any given year, it is anticipated that the construction of those projects would result in a potentially cumulatively considerable increase in criteria air pollutant emissions.

Because there is a reasonable potential for multiple projects occurring at the same time, construction impacts are considered significant under the Reduced Project Alternative.

Furthermore, because the Reduced Project Alternative is not consistent with the growth assumptions of the RAQS, implementation of the adopted plan would not comply with the SANDAG TCM Plan and, therefore, would result in significant air quality impacts. Cumulatively significant impacts associated with sensitive receptors adjacent to the Interstate 5 Freeway would also remain under this alternative. However, given that the Reduced Project Alternative comprises a 25 percent reduction of the proposed UCSP and by extension 25 percent fewer units, the air quality impacts to the Reduced Project Alternative would be potentially less than those incurred under the proposed UCSP. As with the proposed UCSP, mitigation for mobile source reductions of diesel particulates is the responsibility of state and federal agencies, therefore the impact would be significant and unmitigated.

10.2.10 Noise

Noise impacts resulting from implementation of the Reduced Project Alternative would potentially be less than those identified for the proposed UCSP. As with the proposed UCSP, development of the Reduced Project Alternative has the potential to result in significant noise impacts. Development under the Reduced Project Alternative, as with the proposed UCSP, would result in an increase in allowable density along highways and major arterials and adjacent to rail, thereby exposing potentially sensitive receptors (residential and park users) to noise levels in excess of applicable thresholds. However, given that the Reduced Project Alternative comprises a 25 percent reduction of the proposed UCSP and by extension 25 percent fewer residents, the noise impacts resulting from the Reduced Project Alternative would be potentially less than those incurred under the proposed UCSP.

As with the proposed UCSP, all future projects allowed in the Reduced Project Alternative with the potential to be exposed to noise in excess of the specified limits shall be required to complete applicable exterior and interior noise analyses and demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City Planning and Building Director, Community Development Director, or Building Official, that project-specific design includes measures to reduce any noise impacts to below a level of significance.

10.2.11 Public Services and Utilities

Impacts to public services and utilities resulting from the Reduced Project Alternative would be less than those identified for the proposed UCSP. The Reduced Project Alternative represents a decrease in potential population relative to the proposed UCSP, thus reducing the demand for services and utilities. While the Reduced Project Alternative would reduce the demand for public services and utilities resources compared to the proposed UCSP, the same approach to upgrading facilities would need to be implemented.

The City of Chula Vista currently implements a public facilities development impact fee program that requires all new development within the City to contribute their fair share to the funding and construction of needed public infrastructure improvements. In addition, the City imposes various other levies (recreational facilities development impact fees, statutory school impacts fees) and programs (Growth Management Ordinance, Capital Improvement Program) that annually review, reprioritize and schedule needed citywide public infrastructure. In addition, the proposed UCSP and Reduced Project Alternative include a Facilities Implementation Analysis that evaluates ongoing, long-term improvement projects and determines whether long-term projects revenues are sufficiently aligned with long-term potential costs of public infrastructure. Subsequent projects developed under the Reduced Project Alternative (or the proposed UCSP) will be subject to the payment of applicable development impact fees at the rate in effect at the time building permits are issued in order to mitigate significant impacts to public services and utilities.

10.2.12 Population and Housing

Impacts to population and housing resulting from the Reduced Project Alternative would be the same as those identified for the proposed UCSP. As with the proposed UCSP, development of the Reduced Project Alternative would not result in significant population and housing impacts. While the Reduced Project Alternative would also induce substantial population growth it would allow new development and redevelopment that would accommodate growth that is already planned to occur locally. Development in accordance with the Reduced Project Alternative would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people necessitating the construction or replacement of housing elsewhere. Housing that may be removed by future individual projects would not necessitate the construction of housing elsewhere because the overall number of housing units allowed by the Reduced Project Alternative would be sufficient within the UCSP area to accommodate the affected population. The proposed UCSP and the Reduced Project Alternative both forecast development over roughly the same area. As such, both the proposed UCSP and the Reduced Project Alternative have a roughly equivalent potential for affecting population and housing, with both scenarios resulting in effects considered to be not significant.

10.2.13 Hazards/Risk of Upset

Hazardous materials impacts resulting from the Reduced Project Alternative would be roughly identical to those identified for the proposed UCSP. The UCSP area contains numerous known and listed hazardous sites of potential environmental concern. Approximately 103 sites of potential environmental concern were identified in the UCSP Subdistricts Area through recent database research. In addition, the UCSP Subdistricts Area contains several older buildings which may contain hazardous building materials (lead, asbestos, PCBs) that could be exposed during demolition or renovation. The proposed UCSP and the Reduced Project Alternative both forecast development over roughly the

same area. As such, both the proposed plan and the Reduced Project Alternative have an equivalent potential for encountering hazardous materials.

Future development consistent with the Reduced Project Alternative, as with the proposed UCSP, may result in significant impacts if such development allows greater contact between humans and hazards. In either case, significant hazardous materials impacts would be similarly mitigated through compliance with all applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations regarding hazardous materials siting, assessment and remediation. In addition, a risk assessment would be required at all sites within the UCSP area where contamination has been identified or is discovered during future construction activities; and a hazardous building materials survey would be conducted at all buildings in the UCSP area prior to demolition or renovation activities.

10.3 Automobile Priority Alternative

The Automobile Priority Alternative involves the design and designation of area roadways such that the adverse traffic effects identified for the proposed UCSP would be lessened and traffic flow would take priority over pedestrian oriented design. Under this alternative, land use densities and intensities would be the same as with the proposed UCSP, but certain pedestrian-oriented streetscape design features would be eliminated in order to maximize traffic flow. The only impacts that would change in this alternative would be related to traffic flow.

The proposed UCSP identifies roadway improvements that would result in UCSP intersections and street segments operating at LOS D or better. As indicated in the traffic analysis conducted for the UCSP, even with the suggested improvements, the roadway segment of Third Avenue between E and G Streets and three intersections would operate at LOS E. These intersections include:

- Broadway/H Street
- Hilltop Drive/H Street
- Third Avenue/J Street

Additional traffic improvements to mitigate decline in the LOS for these intersections and street segment was not included in the proposed UCSP because of conflicts with plan objectives and right-of-way constraints. Guiding principles of the UCSP are based on smart growth strategies, SANDAG's Regional Transportation Plan (or MOBILITY 2030), and SANDAG's Congestion Management Program, which advise new development to maximize density, reduce automobile congestion by increasing pedestrian, cycling, and public transit activity, and allow residents to enjoy short walking distances to and from employment, housing, shopping, entertainment, and different modes of transportation. In order to fully mitigate traffic impacts within the Subdistricts Area, the UCSP would have had to implement

a traffic mitigation measure that conflicts with the plan's primary objective, thus sacrificing pedestrian-friendly design for automobile-preferred design. In addition, some of these improvements could require additional right-of way that is currently developed with existing commercial and residential uses, which could not be assured at this time.

At the Broadway/H Street intersection (Int. #27), an additional northbound and southbound through lane would be required in order to achieve an acceptable LOS D conditions. However, this improvement would require extensive widening of Broadway and H Street to allow for lane drops. The Automobile Priority Alternative would include this widening. It would, as a result, create longer pedestrian crossings.

At the Hilltop Drive/H Street intersection, the proposed UCSP includes no improvements due to right-of way constraints. The poor LOS at this intersection is primarily caused by the high traffic volumes in the eastbound/westbound movements. Additional through and/or turn lanes would be required in order to improve this intersection to an acceptable LOS. The Automobile Priority Alternative would include this improvement.

At the Third Avenue/J Street intersection, the proposed UCSP includes no improvements due to right-of way constraints. The required improvement is an additional southbound right-turn lane. The Automobile Priority Alternative would include this improvement.

10.3.1 Land Use

Effects to land use resulting from the Automobile Priority Alternative would be identical to those identified for the proposed UCSP. The Automobile Priority Alternative would implement the same zoning as the proposed UCSP. The zoning conforms to the adopted General Plan. Because the Automobile Priority Alternative would result in the same land use regulations as the proposed project, it would not result in the UCSP area being out of compliance with the GPU. Therefore, it would not conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project.

10.3.2 Landform Alteration/Aesthetics

Effects to visual character of the UCSP area resulting from the Automobile Priority Alternative would be identical to those identified for the proposed UCSP. Adoption of the Automobile Priority Alternative would result in substantial changes to visual quality throughout the UCSP area. The projected three-fold increase in residential and commercial population within the UCSP Subdistricts Area would be accommodated through increased density, building heights and mass, as in the proposed UCSP. This intensification of existing land use would be substantial. The existing visual character of low-rise single-use commercial and residential blocks of the UCSP would change to a mix of primarily low rise and mid-rise, with some high-rise, mixed-uses where commercial, office, and high-density residential uses are integrated within the same structure or block. The development

standards and design guidelines which outline allowable and recommended parameters for the development of the Subdistricts Area that are proposed as part of the UCSP would also occur under this alternative. Conditions of approval shall be required on a project by project basis to ensure development is consistent with the UCSP development standards and design guidelines. .

At the Broadway/H Street intersection, the Automobile Priority Alternative would include an additional northbound and southbound through lane. This improvement would require extensive widening. This widening of Broadway and H Street would allow for lane drops, however, it would create longer pedestrian crossings and would result in a less pedestrian friendly environment. While it would avoid the identified traffic impact, it would not meet the goals of the proposed project to enhance pedestrian movement. This change in the Automobile Priority Alternative over the proposed UCSP would result in a negligible difference in the visual quality of this intersection.

At the Hilltop Drive/H Street intersection, the Automobile Priority Alternative would include additional through and/or turn lanes in order to improve this intersection to an acceptable LOS. The poor LOS at this intersection is primarily caused by high traffic volumes in the eastbound/westbound turning movements. The additional through and/or turn lanes needed to improve this intersection were not included in the proposed UCSP due to right-of way constraints. These additional improvements would not result in a noticeable difference in the visual quality of the UCSP area compared to the proposed UCSP.

At the Third Avenue/J Street intersection the Automobile Priority Alternative would include an additional southbound right-turn lane. This improvement would also address Third Avenue traffic congestion between E and G Streets. The additional southbound right turn-lane would impact the Henry's Marketplace building, which is built adjacent to the sidewalk. By comparison, the proposed UCSP proposes the narrowing of the travel way on Third Avenue; one of the through lanes along Third Avenue in each direction would be converted to an exclusive right-turn lane. The purpose of this narrowing is to create a friendlier pedestrian atmosphere in accordance with the goals of the GPU. Provision of the widening and maintenance of the current designated lane configuration would adversely affect the nature of the community at this intersection and represents a significant aesthetic impact.

The resulting difference in visual character arising from the intersection and street segment improvements provided in the Automobile Priority Alternative, but not the proposed UCSP, would be negligible, and the effects to visual character of the UCSP area resulting from the Automobile Priority Alternative would be identical to those identified for the proposed UCSP.

10.3.3 Biological Resources

There are no biological resources within the UCSP area; therefore, no impacts would occur by adoption of the Automobile Priority Alternative.

10.3.4 Cultural and Paleontological Resources

The Automobile Priority Alternative does not change the potential for impacts to cultural and paleontological resources as described in Sections 5.3 and 5.5 of this report. Effects to cultural and paleontological resources resulting from the Automobile Priority Alternative would be identical to those identified for the proposed UCSP. As with the proposed UCSP, the loss or substantial alteration of as-yet unknown historically significant architectural resources or prehistoric and historic archaeological resources would comprise a significant cultural resources impact.

Mitigation measures 5.3.5-1 through 5.3.5-5 and 5.5-1 detailed above would be required to mitigate these impacts from the implementation of the Automobile Priority Alternative. If on a project-specific basis, these actions are demonstrated to be infeasible and the resource would be demolished documentation of the resource per HABS Level I may not be sufficient to reduce impacts to below a level of significance. In that case, impacts to architectural resources may be significant and unmitigated.

10.3.5 Geology and Soils

Impacts to geology and soils resulting from the Automobile Priority Alternative would be identical to those identified for the proposed UCSP. As with the proposed UCSP, implementation of the Automobile Priority Alternative has the potential to result in significant impacts related to geology and soils. Future development would be exposed to geological hazards associated with seismic events, liquefaction, and expansive soils. Potential impacts resulting from geologic hazards would be reduced below a level of significance through project-specific design measures, including compliance with applicable building codes (e.g., Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, and the UBC). Additionally, a comprehensive, site-specific soil and geologic evaluation shall be conducted for all future projects to determine potential hazards and site conditions. The proposed UCSP and the Automobile Priority Alternative both forecast development over the same area. As such, both the proposed plan and the Automobile Priority Alternative have an equivalent potential for impacting geological resources.

10.3.6 Agriculture

There are no agricultural resources within the UCSP area; therefore, no impacts to agricultural resources would occur by the adoption of the Automobile Priority Alternative.

10.3.7 Hydrology and Water Quality

Hydrology and water quality effects resulting from the Automobile Priority Alternative would be identical to those identified for the proposed UCSP. As with the proposed UCSP, implementation of the Automobile Priority Alternative has the potential to result in significant

impacts related to water resources and water quality. Future development would increase runoff by increasing the impermeable surface area in the City. Adherence to water quality control measures required under the San Diego County Municipal Permit would avoid potential water quality impacts. The proposed UCSP and the Automobile Priority Alternative both forecast development over the same area. As such, both the proposed plan and the Automobile Priority Alternative have an equivalent potential for impacting water quality.

10.3.8 Transportation

Transportation impacts resulting from the Automobile Priority Alternative would be less than those identified for the proposed UCSP. The Automobile Priority Alternative would mitigate impacts to the roadway segment of Third Avenue between E and G Streets and the following three intersections by resulting in improvements that would allow them to operate at LOS D or better.

- Broadway/H Street
- Hilltop Drive/H Street
- Third Avenue/J Street

With inclusion of the improvements identified for this alternative, there would be no significant impacts to UCSP intersections. All mitigation measures identified for the proposed UCSP would be required in conjunction with the Automobile Priority Alternative.

Additional traffic improvements to mitigate decline in the LOS for these intersections and street segment was not included in the proposed UCSP because of conflicts with plan objectives and right-of-way constraints. In order to fully mitigate traffic impacts within the Subdistricts Area, the UCSP would have had to implement traffic mitigation measures that conflict with the plan's objectives to enhance pedestrian movement. The acquisition of additional right-of-way was not considered feasible due to the existing built condition at the affected intersections.

10.3.9 Air Quality

Air quality impacts resulting from the Automobile Priority Alternative would be identical to those identified for the proposed UCSP. Because there is a reasonable potential for multiple projects occurring at the same time, construction impacts are significant under both the Automobile Priority Alternative and proposed UCSP. Furthermore, because the Automobile Priority Alternative and the proposed UCSP are not consistent with the growth assumptions of the RAQS, implementation of this alternative would not comply with the SANDAG TCM Plan and, therefore, would result in significant air quality impacts. Cumulatively significant impacts associated with sensitive receptors adjacent to the Interstate 5 Freeway would also remain under this alternative. As with the proposed UCSP,

mitigation for mobile source reductions of diesel particulates is the responsibility of state and federal agencies, therefore the impact would be significant and unmitigated.

10.3.10 Noise

Noise effects resulting from the Automobile Priority Alternative would be identical to those identified for the proposed UCSP. As with the proposed UCSP, development of the Automobile Priority Alternative has the potential to result in significant noise impacts. Development under the Automobile Priority Alternative would result in an increase in allowable density along highways and major arterials, and adjacent to rail. All future projects with the potential to be exposed to noise in excess of the specified limits would be required to complete applicable exterior and interior noise analyses and demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City Planning and Building Director, Community Development Director, or Building Official, that project-specific design includes measures to reduce any noise impacts to below a level of significance.

10.3.11 Public Services and Utilities

Implementation of the Automobile Priority Alternative would result in significant demands for public services and utilities identical to those identified for in the proposed UCSP. Automobile Priority Alternative does not change the project population relative to the proposed UCSP. As such, it does not reduce the demand for services and utilities.

10.3.12 Population and Housing

Impacts to population and housing resulting from the Automobile Priority Alternative would be identical to those identified for the proposed UCSP. As with the proposed UCSP, development of the Automobile Priority Alternative would not result in significant population and housing impacts. While the Automobile Priority Alternative and the proposed UCSP would induce substantial population growth they would allow new development and redevelopment that would accommodate growth that is already planned to occur locally. Development in accordance with the Automobile Priority Alternative and the proposed UCSP would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people necessitating the construction or replacement of housing elsewhere. Housing that may be removed by future individual projects would not necessitate the construction of housing elsewhere because the overall number of housing units allowed by the proposed UCSP and Automobile Priority Alternative would be sufficient within the UCSP area to accommodate the affected population. Both the UCSP and the Automobile Priority Alternative have an equivalent potential for affecting population and housing, with both scenarios resulting in effects considered to be not significant.

10.3.13 Hazards/Risk of Upset

Effects from hazardous materials resulting from the Automobile Priority Alternative would be identical to those identified for the proposed UCSP. The UCSP area contains numerous known and listed hazardous sites of potential environmental concern. Approximately 103 sites of potential environmental concern were identified in the UCSP Subdistricts Area through recent database research. In addition, the UCSP Subdistricts Area contains several older buildings which may contain hazardous building materials (lead, asbestos, PCBs) that could be exposed during demolition or renovation. Future development consistent with the Automobile Priority Alternative, as with the proposed UCSP, may result in significant impacts if such development allows greater contact between humans and hazards. In either case, significant hazardous materials impacts would be similarly mitigated through compliance with all applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations regarding hazardous materials siting, assessment and remediation. In addition, a risk assessment would be required at all sites within the UCSP area where contamination has been identified or is discovered during future construction activities; and a hazardous building materials survey would be conducted at all buildings in the UCSP area prior to demolition or renovation activities.

11.0 References Cited

The following documents were used, referenced, or relied on in preparing this EIR, and the documents are available for public review and inspection of the City of Chula Vista, Community Development Department at 276 Fourth Avenue, and the Chula Vista Civic Center Library at 365 F Street in the City of Chula Vista. Some documents are additionally available for review on the City of Chula Vista website documents page at www.ci.chula-vista.ca.us. These documents are incorporated by reference in this EIR.

Archaeos

- 2005 Cultural Resources Report for the Evaluation of the Historical and Architectural Significance of 50 Properties Within the Chula Vista Urban Core, September.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

- 2005 CEQA Statutes and Guidelines.

California, State of

- 1969 Porter Cologne Water Quality Control Act.
- 1989 Guidelines for Air Quality Impact Assessment for General Development and Transportation-Related Projects. June.
- 1990 California Integrated Waste Management Act.
- 2000 *Risk Reduction Plan to Reduce Particulate Matter Emissions from Diesel-Fueled Engines and Vehicles*. California Air Resources Board. October 2000. Accessed from the CARB website at <http://www.arb.ca.gov/diesel/documents/rrpfinal.pdf> on March 3, 2005.
- 2001 *PM_{2.5} Monitoring Sites in California*. California Air Resources Board Internet Site. URL <http://www.arb.ca.gov/aqd/pm25/pmfmon.htm>. June.
- 2003 *Particulate Matter*. California Air Resources Board Internet Site. URL <http://http://www.arb.ca.gov/research/aaqs/caaqs/pm/pm.htm>.
- 2005a *California's Diesel Risk Reduction Program*. California Air Resources Board Internet Site. URL <http://www.arb.ca.gov/diesel/dieselrrp.htm>. February.
- 2005b *Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective*. California Air Resources Board. April.

Chula Vista, City of

1978a Town Center I Redevelopment Plan.

1978b Town Center II Redevelopment Plan.

1991 Growth Management Program. November.

1994 Chula Vista Landscape Manual.

1997 City of Chula Vista Fire Station Master Plan.

2001a City of Chula Vista Municipal Code – Zoning. July

2001b Assessment of Chula Vista's Energy Management Options. February.

2002a City of Chula Vista Police Department – Growth Management Oversight Commission's Quality of Life Threshold Standards. May.

2002b Draft Air Quality Improvement Plan Guidelines. December.

2002c Index Pilot Test: SPA Air Quality Improvement Plans. June.

2002d Broadway Revitalization Strategy.

2003 Historic Preservation Strategic Plan. August.

2004 Merged Redevelopment Plan. May.

2005a City of Chula Vista General Plan Update. December.

2005b City of Chula Vista General Plan Update EIR. December.

2005c Chula Vista Fire Department, personal communication. August.

2006a *City of Chula Vista Urban Core Specific Plan*. Public Review Draft. April.

2006b Chula Vista Elementary School District, personal communication, March.

Regional Water Quality Control Board [RWQCB]

1975 Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin (9).

Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. 2005

2005 Final Traffic Impact Analysis, Chula Vista Urban Core. October.

Ninyo and Moore Geotechnical and Environmental Sciences Consultants

- 2003 Natural Hazards/Geology Baseline Study, City of Chula Vista General Plan Update. January 6.

PBS&J

- 2004 City of Chula Vista 2004 General Plan Update Hydrology Study. December.
- 2005 Wastewater Master Plan for the City of Chula Vista. May.

RECON

- 2003 Final Baseline Study for the City of Chula Vista Solid and Hazardous Waste/Hazardous Materials. RECON Number 3776E. October 14.
- 2005 Noise Technical Study for the City of Chula Vista Urban Core Specific Plan. RECON Number 4066N. July 6.
- 2006 Air Quality Report for the Urban Core Specific Plan. RECON Number 4066Q. May 23.

San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)

- 2006 <http://www.sandag.cog.ca.us/>
Regional Comprehensive Plan
Regional Transportation Plan/Mobility 2030
Congestion Management Program
Regional Housing Program
MTDB/Southbay Transit First Study
Regional Transit Vision

San Diego, County of

- 1992 1991/1992 Regional Air Quality Strategies. San Diego Air Pollution Control District. June.
- 1998 *Air Quality in San Diego County*. 1997 Annual Report. San Diego Air Pollution Control District.
- 1999 *Air Quality in San Diego County*. 1998 Annual Report. San Diego Air Pollution Control District.
- 2000a Technical Appendices for Final Environmental Impact Report – Otay Landfill Development and Expansion Plan. Prepared for Department of Planning and Land Use. February.

- 2000b *Air Quality in San Diego County*. 1999 Annual Report. San Diego Air Pollution Control District.
- 2000c Draft Air Quality Analysis Format Guidelines. August 18.
- 2001a Fact Sheets. San Diego APCD website: http://www.sdapcd.co.san-diego.ca.us/facts/info_facts.html.
- 2001b 2000 Air Toxics "Hot Spots" Program Report for San Diego County. California Air Toxics "Hot Spots" Information and Assessment Act (AB2588), October.
- 2002a *Attainment Status – Fact Sheet*. San Diego Air Pollution Control District. January.
- 2002b *Frequently Asked Questions*. San Diego Air Pollution Control District Internet Site. URL <http://www.sdapcd.co.san-diego.ca.us/news/FAQS.htm>. January.
- 2004 Department of Planning and Land Use Community Planning and Subregional Areas website: <http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/cnty/cntydepts/landuse/planning/GP2020/comm/sweetwater.htm>.
- San Diego County Water Authority
- 2000 Urban Water Management Plan.
- Sweetwater Authority
- 2000 Urban Water Management Plan.
- 2002 Water Distribution Master Plan.
- 2005 Water Supply Assessment for the UCSP.
- U.S. Census Bureau
- 1990 U.S. Census data.
- 2000 U.S. Census data.
- 2003 U.S. Census, <http://www.census.gov>.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
- 1986 Guidelines for Ground-Water Classification Under the [1984] EPA Ground-Water Protection Strategy, Final Draft", Office of Ground-Water Protection, November.
- 1990 Federal Clean Air Act, Section 109.

- 1997 *Implementation of Standards – Fact Sheet*. United States Office Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Air & Radiation, Office of Air Quality Planning & Standards Internet Site URL <http://www.epa.gov/ttn.oarpg/naaqsf/implem.html>. June.
- 2002 Plain English Guide to the Clean Air Act. U.S. EPA website: http://www.epa.gov/oar/oaqps/peg_caa/pegcaain.html. May.
- 2004a Air Quality Designations and Classifications for the 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards; Early Action Compact Areas With Deferred Effective Dates; Final Rule. *Federal Register* 69(84):23857-23951, April 30.
- 2004b Final Rule To Implement the 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard – Phase 1; Final Rule. *Federal Register* 69(84):23951-24000, April 30.
- 2004c Air Quality Designations and Classifications for the Fine Particles (PM_{2.5}) National Ambient Air Quality Standards; Final Rule. *Federal Register* 70(3):944-1019, January 5.

12.0 EIR Preparation

This environmental impact report was prepared by the City of Chula Vista. The City was assisted by RECON, located at 1927 Fifth Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101. The following professional staff participated in the preparation of the EIR:

City of Chula Vista

Dana Smith, Assistant City Manager/Community Development Director

Ann Hix, Assistant Director, Community Development Department

Mary Ladiana, Planning Manager

Brian Sheehan, Senior Community Development Specialist

Ann Moore, City Attorney

John Mullen, Deputy City Attorney

Michael Shirey, Deputy City Attorney

Jim Hare, Assistant Director of Planning and Building

Alex Al-Agha, City Engineer

Frank Rivera, Principal City Engineer

Dave Kaplan, Transportation Engineer

Jim Newton, Senior Civil Engineer

Anthony Chukwudolue, Senior Civil Engineer

Roberto Yano, Senior Civil Engineer

Doug Perry, Fire Chief

Jim Geering, Deputy Fire Chief

Buck Martin, Recreation Director

Joe Gamble, Landscape Planner

Ed Hall, Senior Recreation Supervisor

Dave Byers, Director of Public Works Operations

Kirk Ammerman, Principal Civil Engineer

Tom Adler, Senior Civil Engineer

Khosro Aminpour, Senior Civil Engineer

Ed Chew, Administrative Services Manager, Police Department

Daniel Forster, Growth Management Coordinator

J. Luis Hernandez, Deputy Planning Director

Richard Preuss, Police Community Relations Specialist

Michael Hogan, Outside Legal Counsel

RECON

Adrienne M. Beeson, Environmental Analyst
Karen Bowling, Environmental Analyst
Charles S. Bull, President
David M. Gottfredson, Environmental Analyst
Karla Hellestrae, Environmental Analyst
Stacey Higgins, Production Specialist
Cheryl Johnson, Acoustical Analyst
Brian Leslie, Environmental Analyst
Vince Martinez, GIS Specialist
Sean Bohac, GIS Specialist

PBS&J

Kimley-Horn and Associates

Dave Sorenson
Marc Mizuta